QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY IRC

The Why of Change

Dr. Carol A. Beatty
Queen's University IRC

"He who has a why to live can bear almost any how." – Friedrich Nietzsche

When I was a child I drove my mother crazy asking "why" questions. Perhaps you did the same. Why did she make up stupid rules such as "brush your teeth" or "wash your hands before you eat"? I wouldn't accept her standard response: "Because I said so." These rules didn't make sense to me and would have meant a change in behaviour. I needed to know and accept the reasons behind the rules before I was willing to change.

The same applies if you are trying to change employee behaviour in the workplace. Underneath our grownup veneer, we are still children asking, "Why?" We resist a change unless we see a good reason for it. A manager's equivalent of "because I said so" won't get you very far. So the first question you must answer when proposing a change is: Why? And you better have some very good reasons or your change will be off to a bad start.

Keeping Up With Change in the Organization

But before dealing with the "why" questions, let's step back and acknowledge that organizations often seem unaware of important external events that will impact them greatly. Many organizations fail because they are blindsided by changes in their environment. Consider what happened in the retail industry in North America in the last few decades. Of the top 100 retail discounters in business in 1975, 76 were gone by 1994. What happened? Walmart blew them away. In 1983, Walmart sales were $4.8 billion with its existing 641 stores. By 2001, Walmart was the world's largest retailer with sales of $223 billion and an astounding 4,190 stores. During that time many of Walmart's existing competitors went bankrupt. They were victims of change.

Often, changes in the organization's environment are screaming a warning that change is necessary, but the organization doesn't hear that warning. Too much time is spent explaining and rationalizing current practices, policies, procedures and rules, when what is needed is time spent looking to the future. Looking at and dealing with the future is tough work and so is often avoided. A classic example of this occurred in the Swiss watch industry. In 1945, Swiss firms accounted for 80 percent of the world's total watch production and 99 percent of all U.S. watch imports. Then at a 1967 watch fair, inventors from the Swiss Watch Institute exhibited an electronic quartz movement. But Swiss watchmakers did not adopt the invention because it didn't fit their paradigm of what a watch should be. In their view, anyone could use the quartz movement, whereas only the Swiss had the skills to make little cogwheels and balance springs. This classic innovator's dilemma almost killed the Swiss watch industry. Watchmakers in Japan eagerly grabbed the quartz movement, and in one year in the late 1960s the sales of Swiss watches dropped by 25 percent. By 1970, the Swiss share of the world watch market was down to about 40 percent and falling fast.

Fortunately, the Swiss watch industry learned from this mistake and made a comeback. In 1983, the two largest watchmaking groups in the country decided to merge rather than go bankrupt, and they created the Swatch brand. Swatch decided it was not selling time so much as fun and costume jewelry, and it redefined the watch as a fashion accessory for the masses. By the end of 2003, the Swatch Group was the second-leading producer of watches in the world after Japan's Citizen Watch Company, Ltd.

The lesson from these examples is clear: you must keep up with changes in the external environment or you will struggle to survive. Or even worse, your organization could disappear.

The Importance of Identifying External Change Drivers

Today, most organizations face a dynamic and rapidly changing business environment. They must learn to adapt to a world of recessions, disruptive technologies, regulation and deregulation, changes in standards and in customer expectations, short product lifecycles, continual innovation, and so forth. Those who know how to cope with change will thrive, and those who have their heads in the sand will adapt too late or not at all. One of the best ways to avoid being blindsided by these changes is to engage in regular and frequent strategic reviews. Our advice is to survey the business environment thoroughly and often for what we call "change drivers"—the external factors and trends that the organization needs to deal with and respond to in order to remain viable. Examine what is occurring in the following categories: business and competitive environment; political and regulatory issues; economic conditions; social and demographic shifts; and technological developments.

Business and Competitive Environment

Organizations must change faster than their competitors to maintain a competitive advantage. How frequently they have to adapt depends on how rapidly their industry or markets are changing.

If you are in a fast-moving industry, you can learn a lot from the Spanish fashion retailer Zara. Zara takes only two weeks from designing product to putting new stock in stores. Competitors typically take six to nine months. One fatal flaw in the fashion industry is the inability to forecast trends quickly and accurately, which guarantees there will be costly inventory buildups. Zara designers hang out in plazas, nightclubs and other trendy venues to see what "it people" are wearing. They watch popular films and the latest music videos. They make use of the latest technology, and all of the information gathered is sent to headquarters and Zara's 1,160 stores. Daily sales determine what is still in demand—and so needs restocking—and what is "out." Twice a week, small shipments are sent from headquarters to stores around the world. If customers like the fashion, they must buy it now because it won't be in the shops the following week. This attracts a trend-conscious crowd and creates a competitive advantage that is hard to imitate.[1]

Even in more slowly-moving environments, such as the public sector, competition can gather steam and force large internal change. During the early eighties, political shifts in many countries, most notably in England and the U.S., caused a wave of public sector reforms. The assumption was that these reforms, many of which involved creating competition from private sector organizations, would encourage greater efficiency.

Canada has not been as quick to adopt these approaches but is nonetheless proceeding along the same path. For example, many federal departments have been transformed into special operating agencies that are expected to function more like private sector companies. Two other common initiatives include developing public-private partnerships and contracting out to alternative service providers.[2] In both the public and private sectors, competition has proven to be the single largest driver of cost reductions and quality improvements. Therefore, politicians and citizens alike should expect to keep on promoting competition in the public sector. One good Canadian public sector example of a partnership initiative is BizPaL, highlighted in the following case study.

---

[1] Ghemawat, P., and Nueno, J.L. (2003) Zara: Fast fashion, Technical report, Harvard Business School Multimedia Case 9, pp. 703-487.

[2] Dean, T. (2011) Why competition between civil servants, corporations and non-profits is good for everyone, *Literary Review of Canada*, September. http://reviewcanada.ca/magazine/2011/09/is-public-service-delivery-obsolete/.

<div style="border:1px solid">

Case Study: BizPaL

Canadians often complain about government red tape, which makes the Canadian business environment less competitive. One such irritant for business owners is finding out what permits and licenses they need to start and operate their businesses, which at one time required contacting many different departments of three levels of government. BizPaL was the solution. Launched in 2005, BizPaL is a partnership involving governments at the federal, provincial, territorial and municipal levels that provides web access to information about permits and licences. For the user, BizPaL generates a thorough, exhaustive and numbered list of all permits needed by a given entrepreneur, including costs, expected waiting periods, inspections, other requirements and downloadable forms. The award-winning initiative generated excellent results, as illustrated by the following:

"One study in Yukon showed that before BizPaL, it took a knowledgeable territorial government employee five hours over three days to identify just the territorial permit and licence requirements for a single business sector. With BizPaL, however, any entrepreneur can find complete information applicable to his or her business at all levels of government in less than five minutes." [3]

</div>

Whether your organization is in the public or private sector, expect competitive forces to act as perpetual drivers of change. Don't ignore them. Do the tough work and deal with the reality of a constantly changing competitive environment. Here is a list of the useful questions to answer to identify the important competitive forces that may affect your organization:

- Who are our competitors? What have they been up to recently? Any new game-changing mergers, technologies, products, processes? Are there any potential sources of competition from unexpected quarters? How big of a threat do they pose?

- How easy or difficult is it for new competitors to enter our industry? Are there, or can we develop, barriers to entry?

- Are there currently any substitutes for the products/services we provide? If not, could there be in the near future? How much of a threat would they be?

- How crowded is our industry? Are most of our competitors using the same types of competitive strategies, and if so, can we do something different?

- What are the implications for us? What will happen if we don't respond in the near future?

Answering these questions should help your organization analyze present and future competitive forces and prepare a response well before a crisis threatens.

Political and Regulatory Issues

An organization exists within a political environment, which is constantly changing. The risk always exists that a change in laws and regulations will materially impact your organization, either by increasing the costs of operating a business or by changing the competitive landscape. In recent decades, many Canadian organizations have had to adapt to the North American Free Trade Agreement, the globalization of markets, deregulation, privatization of government agencies, the influence of interest groups, such as the environmental lobby, and the list goes on.

---

[3] (2006) Canadian Information Productivity Awards, 2006 C.I.P.A. Winners, http://www.cipa.ca/award_winners/winners_06/Bizpal.html.

Another political issue in Canada is the perceived or real political risk of Quebec separation, which has resulted in many private sector corporations moving their head offices out of the province. Managers must consider the implications of such developments and decide what changes, if any, must be made.

Yet many surveys report the absence of any formal or systematic assessment of the political environment and its possible impact within the organization.[4] That was not the approach taken by the company highlighted in the next highlighted case study. Syncrude assessed the political environment both formally and systematically and then responded in a timely and sophisticated way. Organizations should constantly assess the political and regulatory landscape for potential challenges and risks. Some organizations create special units to do this sort of analysis. Others hire lawyers or consultants to assist with this task. Conferences and special reports can also help. However you tackle this, you should ask: What changes in the political and regulatory environment must we respond to? How quickly? Which pose the most risk for us?

Case Study: Syncrude—Partners in Development[5]

Headquartered in Fort McMurray, Alberta, Syncrude was formed as a joint venture of several major oil exploration and production companies to mine northern Alberta's Athabasca oil sands. This rather remote deposit is the largest petroleum resource in the world, covering an area larger than the state of Florida and containing more oil reserves than those in Saudi Arabia. But extraction is complex, and oil sands development is recognized as one of the top ten engineering achievements in Canada.[6]

In addition to tough operating and technical challenges, Syncrude faces daunting stakeholder and environmental issues. The company must interact with at least thirty-nine stakeholder groups, beginning with the nine different project owners who form the joint venture, each of whom has a separate lease agreement for the Athabasca oil sands. Because environmental assessments have estimated that oil sands produce four times more upstream gas emissions and six times more carbon dioxide than conventional oil production, environmental and local community groups are continually concerned about pollution from the mines. All company project plans have to pass a government public hearing process in which stakeholders are invited to give input. Preparation for these hearings is very expensive and can tie up technical and other resources for up to two years. To advance projects, the interests of government bodies at all levels, local residents, environment groups, employees and shareholders must be carefully balanced. One very important stakeholder in this mix is the Aboriginal community.

At its inception in the 1970s, the Syncrude project was perceived by many as threatening to an Aboriginal way of life that depended on hunting and fishing. But a win-win outcome was possible. The Native population contained a pool of potential workers in a remote site where it is difficult to attract qualified employees. Furthermore, the local Aboriginal unemployment rate was hovering around 80 percent, so high-paying Syncrude jobs could have been attractive to them. Unfortunately, many Native people in the area lacked both the business and technical skills the company needed at the time. So Syncrude took the first step of establishing an "Action Plan for Native Training and Counselling" as well as a formal "Native Development Program." These programs were designed to improve Aboriginal education levels and promote cultural awareness within the company's non-Aboriginal supervisors.

[4] LaPalombara, J., and Blank, S. (1976) *Multinational Corporations and National Elites: A Study in Tensions.* (New York: The Conference Board).
[5] From an unpublished case study prepared by Carol A. Beatty from publicly available documents. Contact the author to obtain a copy.
[6] Andrews, G.C. (2009) *Canadian Professional Engineering and Geoscience: Practice and Ethics*, 4th ed. (Toronto: Nelson Education), p. 3.

Case Study: Syncrude—Partners in Development (continued)

Then in the 1980s, a formal Native Affairs Department was launched to help Aboriginal employees within Syncrude compete for company jobs. During the construction phase of the mines, Syncrude set goals to maximize the number of Native people in construction and in full-time company positions, and to encourage economic development in local Native communities. Three goals that Syncrude pursued throughout the plant's construction and operations were: maximizing the number of Native people in construction; maximizing the number of Native people in full-time positions; and encouraging economic development in Native communities.

A collaborative effort between committed leaders inside the company and in the Native community, both locally and provincially, began the process of realizing these goals. The company, in partnership with the local community college, put training programs in place and funded scholarships to those programs. But despite these efforts, the company could not seem to raise Aboriginal participation in the workforce above 5 to 6 percent—well below the company's target. So Syncrude ramped up its efforts. Led by Chief Executive Officer Eric Newell and President and Chief Operating Officer Jim Carter, the company began a program of intensive partnership initiatives with the local Aboriginal population, which took place over the period of almost twenty years. Syncrude declined to compromise its high standards, so it had to assume a large role in developing Aboriginal employees' skills and ensuring that they felt comfortable working with non-Native co-workers. Newell clarified: "Another key to success for Syncrude has been to recognize that cultural differences exist. Our development program hasn't been one of assimilating a minority culture within a majority culture. What we are striving to do is learn how to benefit from both cultural groups."

In 1992, they also set a goal of purchasing at least $30 million in goods and services from businesses owned by Aboriginal people and created a policy to give preference to these businesses over other contractors and suppliers. These businesses specialized in equipment operation, construction, transportation, waste management and land reclamation, among other services. In addition, certain types of work were earmarked exclusively for Aboriginal businesses. To increase success, the company provided specialists to coach Aboriginal entrepreneurs in honing their business and technical skills and appointed a full-time Aboriginal business coordinator to help them apply andmeet contract requirements. In some cases, Syncrude even helped create new Aboriginal companies.

Finding and helping individual entrepreneurs is exhausting work, so in 1993 the company helped set up the Northeastern Alberta Aboriginal Business Association (NAABA) as a means of networking for Aboriginal entrepreneurs. And the company promoted internships, apprenticeship programs and career fairs to attract Aboriginal students to Syncrude jobs. Finally these programs began to bear fruit, and by 1994 the original goals of 13 percent Aboriginal employment and $30 million in Aboriginal business contracts were surpassed.

Syncrude also participated in community cultural projects. To help preserve local traditions and increase awareness of Aboriginal history and culture, Syncrude partnered with the Provincial Museum of Alberta (now called the "Royal Alberta Museum") and contributed a third of the costs to create the Syncrude Gallery of Aboriginal Culture. Syncrude also embarked on environmental projects to reclaim land from mining operations. One notable example: in 1993 they planned to introduce cattle onto reclaimed land, but a consultation with leaders at the Fort McKay First Nation led to a reintroduction of the more traditional wood bison instead. In addition, Syncrude helped build community infrastructure through the funding of community halls, schools, recreation centres and healthcare programs in the area.

These programs, as excellent as they were, were mainly company initiated and driven. And although they generated goodwill, a true partnership between Syncrude and the community was not yet a reality. This point hit home during a contentious 1993 public hearing in front of the Alberta Energy and Utilities Board. Some felt that the company had tried to rush the consultation process and get a quick decision on a mine development project. It was a pivotal event. After all of their efforts to cooperate with and help the Aboriginal communities, Syncrude leaders could have been forgiven for becoming discouraged. Instead, they reassessed the program and concluded that their efforts to date had been largely top-down and one-way. So they recommitted to true partnership-building based on two-way dialogue and collaboration.

One of the key changes in Syncrude's new approach was to involve affected communities in the very design of the consultation process. This approach was so successful that after this point, Aboriginal stakeholders were almost always on side during the public hearings for large projects, which in turn made it easier for regulators to give the needed approvals. Even though some environmental groups remained hostile to oil sands development, the government was sufficiently confident in Syncrude's plans that it cancelled extensive public hearings in 1997 and again in 1998.

Now partnership with stakeholders appears to be part of the company's DNA. Aboriginal employment is no longer managed through special programs but is integrated into the company's business practices as part of the key results areas that the company requires its managers and employees to work towards. The company no longer needs a formal Native Affairs Department but it still provides key services through its Aboriginal steering committee. And it still employs a full-time Aboriginal business coordinator to help Aboriginal entrepreneurs work with Syncrude.

By 1994, Syncrude had reached its target, and Aboriginal employment reached 13 percent of the company's extended workforce of company and contractor employees. In 2001, it spent $92 million on goods and services from Aboriginal-owned businesses, more than 20 percent of the $425 million purchased in the Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo. And the effort continues. An "Aboriginal Human Resources Scorecard," published in the company's 2006 Aboriginal Review, showed this progress.

Table 1: Syncrude "Aboriginal Human Resources Scorecard," 2006

	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Syncrude Direct Workforce					
Total Aboriginal employees (#)	420	407	389	388	390
Female Aboriginal (#)	125	116	112	111	115
Male Aboriginal (#)	295	291	277	277	275
Representation in total workforce (%)	9.2	9.1	9.2	9.4	9.6
Recruitment and Retention					
Aboriginal new hires (% of all hired)	7.3	9.0	7.0	9.7	9.7
Aboriginal attrition rate (%)	9.8	8.0	7.0	6.2	6.6
Aboriginal employee service (average number of years)	10.6	11.2	11.2	11.0	10.1

Developing excellent stakeholder relationships is part of what Syncrude terms its "social licence to operate and grow." Obtaining community support for new developments decreases costs and development time by expediting approvals in public hearings. It also helps maintain goodwill with regulators, who must look after stakeholder concerns. By committing to building true collaboration with stakeholders, Syncrude can serve as a model for those facing tough political and regulatory challenges.

Economic Conditions

Canada is an affluent, high-tech, industrial society with a market-oriented economic system and high living standards. Closer integration with the U.S. from the 1989 U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement (FTA) and the 1994 North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) means that our economy is very much influenced by economic conditions in the U.S., including boom and bust cycles, employment rates, consumer spending, interest rates, currency exchange rates and foreign investment. That being said, Canadian economic conditions are also subject to other factors, such as unique government policy, foreign investments, debt levels, rich natural resources, a strong human capital base and world economic developments. Managers need to be aware of developments in each of these areas and assess their implications for their organizations.

Let's consider the case of a recession and how it can impact a typical organization. A private sector firm will probably experience a decline in sales and profits, whereas a public sector organization will be put under pressure to reduce costs. Both may have to make some or all of the following adjustments:
• Hiring freezes
• Wage and/or benefits freezes
• Layoffs, perhaps resulting in more work for existing employees
• Cancellations of new projects and new products
• Cuts to research and development, marketing, training, etc.

Each of these effects of the recession will entail changes within the organization that must be managed carefully if the organization is to remain healthy and survive the recession intact. A good public sector example of the radical changes brought about by a recession and the tough work of dealing with it is in the following case study.

Case Study: Downsizing at the Ontario Ministry of Labour[7]

The Project

When Vic Pakalnis, eastern regional director of the Ontario Ministry of Labour (MOL), first heard the news that his organization had to be cut by 40 percent over a one-year period, he wasn't daunted by the prospect of being among those to perform the risky surgery. After all, he'd be working as part of a close-knit, experienced team of executives that had successfully decentralized the MOL six years before. And although the outcome was non-negotiable, he felt confident that his team could add value by planning out the process. What troubled Pakalnis and his colleagues on this downsizing committee was whether so much could be cut so quickly without killing the organization.

The Context

It was 1995, and harsh fiscal realities were being faced throughout the Ontario Public Service (OPS). The province was reeling from the effects of a recession, and strong fiscal pressure on the newly elected Conservative government motivated it to begin downsizing the public service and privatizing non-core business. Each ministry was given its own target for spending cuts. The MOL's task was to find a way to slice 40 percent out of its budget.

---

7   Beatty, C. A. (2007) Downsizing success at the Ministry of Labour. Queen's Industrial Relations Centre. Contact the author to obtain a copy.

Clearly, the ministry's comprehensive programs to promote safe, fair workplaces and practices would have to be radically reduced and some even cut. Many people would lose their jobs. If the cuts weren't done judiciously, a damaging political backlash was inevitable.

The Process

The downsizing team began by examining every aspect of the MOL, from its mandate to its structure. The deputy had set out specific guidelines for the change strategy. For example, it was to be business driven, matching resources with core businesses; have realistic but aggressive timelines; include a comprehensive communications plan; preserve the regional structure and involve coordinated development and implementation within and between divisions (e.g., people being "surplused" would have a first shot at other OPS jobs according to seniority); and be linked to the other cost-cutting initiatives in the OPS-wide administrative restructuring.

Keeping these factors in mind, the downsizing committee decided to go back to basics and ultimately narrowed the ministry's focus to enforcement. Next, all ministry activities were evaluated in terms of the core business. "We asked ourselves, for example: 'Are we going to do health and safety inspections?' The answer was yes, that's a basic function of government," says Pakalnis. "Then we asked: 'Are we going to do mediation advisory services?' We debated and debated, and eventually decided that the private sector and universities could offer this, and it was not part of MOL's core business. It was a function we undertook that was useful but not essential." Gradually, a clear picture of a restructured ministry emerged.

Once the strategy of what, how and when to cut was hammered out, it was given to directors and managers in the field for fine tuning. Then the same directors who planned the change were responsible for implementing it. "I did the downsizing in the east and had to surplus people I'd known for years," Pakalnis says. "It was difficult, no question about it."

Implementation: Quick cuts to get the pain over with

The committee decided that the best approach was to get the pain over with, and it acted quickly. Project management techniques helped ensure key milestones were marked and reached. "Once we were into the implementation stage, we worked by the numbers—you can get sidetracked so easily otherwise," recalls Pakalnis. Success was measured in terms of the milestones, and overall, by how well fiscal targets were met and by assessing the health of core services, such as workplace health and safety.

The deputy minister worked tirelessly to keep directors, managers and employees onside, explaining the vision of a smaller, more focused ministry that monitored the system to ensure it was working. Managers, in particular, were kept well informed. "We knew if we lost the managers' hearts and minds, we were in big trouble," says Pakalnis. "There was a big investment there to make sure they knew what would be left at the end of the day and could communicate it to staff." Managers were invited to frequent meetings in their regional offices and in Toronto with the division executive committee. Also, the directors held weekly team meetings with their managers, shared relevant correspondence and sent email updates on changes.

Employees were kept up-to-date via open forums, regular meetings with their managers, timely memos, and Q&As and other written materials. Unions were kept informed about changes, centrally and locally, through employee relations committee meetings. Specific communications plans were prepared for stakeholders who would be affected. This was done to make sure staff were informed about the new core business and expenditure reductions, for example, or to tell clients about the new focus and services.

<div style="border: 1px solid red; padding: 1em;">

Case Study: Downsizing at the Ontario Ministry of Labour (continued)

As expected, the unions were vocal in criticizing the government, and there was a lot of internal stress. Managers and employees who lost their jobs were removed quickly, and human resources personnel provided support to ensure messaging and scripts and surplus letters were ready for directors, who were coached on how to deliver the bad news in a compassionate yet clear way. Also, employee assistance plans, training and reasonable severance packages were put in place to help people feel confident they could land on their feet.

The Outcome

So what happened? "It didn't just survive, it thrived," Pakalnis says. The MOL met its target to cut the program budget by 40 percent, and indicators of how well the MOL was doing actually improved. "Overall, the number of field inspections completed increased, and the accident rate went down. In the five years following the downsizing, we had a drop of 30 percent in lost-time injuries in this province."[8]

</div>

Your organization cannot avoid the risks from economic challenges, such as a recession, but you can respond quickly and nimbly as was the case with the Ministry of Labour. Economic forecasts are notoriously inaccurate, so scenario planning is one tool that many organizations have used to their benefit. In scenario planning, a group of organizational members, most often executives, develops a small number of economic scenarios (stories about how the future might unfold) and then plans responses to each of them.

Social and Demographic Shifts

Society is continually changing. Analyzing demographic information such as age, gender, family structure, life cycles and stages of the population, location and migration patterns, and immigration statistics will enable you to predict demand for your products and/or services. For example, one such demographic trend in Canada is an ageing population. In his blog post on the Forbes magazine website, Bill Conerly predicts: "The baby boomers are getting ready for retirement. As a result, the number of people between 20 and 65 will grow much more slowly than in past decades. In the present decade, growth will be just one third of what we are used to, and next decade will be even lower. So if your business, government agency or non-profit has a long-run plan that includes more workers, you'll also need a plan to get those workers from somewhere other than routine population growth."[9] This means companies will need to prepare for a dramatically altered workforce.

One adaptive strategy might be to employ more retired workers. However, to attract and retain older workers, organizations may have to make changes to human resources policies and offer more part-time work and flexible benefit packages. These older workers may also require additional training to keep up with new technologies. Or the organization may want to recruit workers from the large and youthful Canadian Aboriginal population. That would also necessitate adjustments to human resources policies. In other words, each change may lead to further adjustments. Forecasting all of these changes takes thinking and planning ahead. It is tough work.

As well as demographic trends, tastes and fashions can also affect your organization, and they change constantly. For example, organic food is rising in importance and was forecast to account for 20 percent

---

[8] For advice on downsizing best practices, visit: http://irc.queensu.ca/articles/downsizing-your-organization-lessons-trenches.

[9] Conerly, B. (2014) Long-term economic forecast: Key issues and business strategy implications, Forbes.com, January 12. http://www.forbes.com/sites/billconerly/2014/01/12/long-term-economic-forecast-key-issues-and-business-strategy-implications/.

of all supermarket food purchases by 2010. Furthermore, celebrities, television shows and major films all have a big impact on what we consider fashionable and therefore on what we buy. How we buy is also changing. Shoppers use smartphones and tablets to buy things any time, night and day. Businesses need to monitor these changes and, whenever possible, anticipate them.

Social values evolve more slowly than tastes and fashions. A social value typically lasts from twenty to fifty years. Changes in social values can occur because of changes in moral or religious values, scientific findings, media influences, economic conditions or technological innovations, to name a few. For example, consider the case of women working outside the home. One hundred years ago, women didn't work outside the home, but eventually this idea evolved so that women could work and now must work outside the home—a 180 degree shift.[10] One value shift that has taken some North American companies by surprise in recent years is the change in attitudes towards corporate corruption. The following case study offers a sobering example of what can happen if your organization does not adapt fast enough.

Case Study: Changing Attitudes About Corporate Corruption Causes Turmoil at Siemens[11]

"The attitude toward foreign corruption, until recently, was, 'Look, that's the way they do it in China, in Italy, in Asia, in the Middle East. Who are we to tell them how to run their world? So when in Rome, do as the Romans do.' That was the attitude. And that is now coming under pressure," says Milos Barutciski, a partner at Bennett Jones who heads anti-corruption investigations.[12] But this may be changing as a result of high profile prosecutions against companies pursuing alleged corrupt business practices. Siemens is a case in point.

In 2006, Siemens was facing a corruption scandal that ultimately resulted in over $4 billion in fines to the company. The company was accused of such practices as securing contracts for power generation equipment in Italy, telecommunications infrastructure in Nigeria and national identity cards in Argentina through bribes. What followed was radical change within the firm to try and establish what they called a "culture of integrity."

First of all, a new CEO, Peter Löscher, was appointed in 2007 after some of the board members had quit and a number of key executives were facing prosecution. In order to root out corrupt practices across the business, amnesty was offered to staff, excluding former directors. Those who came forward, admitted any involvement in bribery and offered related information could keep their job. Those who did not and who later might be implicated in wrongdoings would be fired. Fundamental changes were made to the overall corporate governance with amendments to the make-up and structure of the boards as well. Furthermore, to counter risk from the largely autonomous businesses at local levels, the company was restructured from seventy to fourteen "clusters" overseen by a steering group.

This case shows how an organization can be blindsided by failing to take into account changing societal norms and their implications for business practices. No doubt the attitudes within Siemens up to that point reflected what Milos Barutciski characterized as: "'Look, that's the way they do it in China, in Italy, in Asia, in the Middle East. Who are we to tell them how to run their world?'"

---

[10] Masters, J. (2005) Social values and public policy: From opportunities to rights and back to opportunities, Center for Community Futures, January 26. http://www.cencomfut.com/social_values.htm.

[11] Barman, T. (2014) Rethinking the value chain—Ethical cultural change at Siemens: A case study, Chartered Global Management Accountant, May. http://www.cgma.org/Resources/DownloadableDocuments/ethical-culture-change-at-siemens.pdf.

[12] Brownell, C. (2014) One in five executives thinks corruption is widespread in Canada's business world, EY report shows, *Financial Post*, June 11. http://business.financialpost.com/2014/06/11/ey-canada-curruption/?__lsa=0673-673a.

Don't let your organization get blindsided by changing social and demographic trends. Ask: What social issues are most relevant to who we are and what we do? What social issues contain our growth or hurt our competitive position? What social issues pose the most risk to our organization if we don't anticipate and deal with them now?

Technological Developments

One of the greatest jolts from the environment is the unprecedented pace of technological change. Think about the impact of computers and smartphones, of the internet, e-commerce, genetics, miniaturization and social media, to name a few. A new technology can confer competitive advantage to early adopters, but others must ultimately also adopt new technologies to keep up. Mobile communications, for example, have changed the way we think about almost everything. Your children, your co-workers and even your parents are using mobile phones in new ways to do everyday tasks like deposit cheques or board planes. This wave of change will continue to grow in the years to come according to the following laws of technological development:

• Moore's Law: Computer processing power will double every eighteen months.

• Gilders' Law: Bandwidth is growing three times faster than computing power.

• Information Explosion: The volume of new data in the world is doubling every two years.[13]

• Schumpeter's Laws of Creative Destruction: Old companies and industries will be swept aside by outsiders using new technologies.

• de Geus's Law of Learning: The only sustainable competitive advantage is the ability to learn faster than your competitors.

The Implications of a Technological Change: Driverless Cars[14]

As reported by Dan Ovsey in the Financial Post on June 17, 2014, the automobile company Volvo is planning to introduce a pilot test of one hundred self-driving cars on fifty kilometers of public roadways in Gothenburg, Sweden. The impact of driverless vehicles on accident rates, energy use, urban planning and household dynamics, as well as other factors, is expected to be tremendous. For example, self-driving vehicles will allow for narrower lanes to be added to existing roadways, tunnels and bridges, and will influence how infrastructure dollars are spent.

Marcus Rothoff, autonomous driving program director for Volvo in Sweden, foresees driverless cars dropping off individuals at their destinations in the city and driving themselves away to the city's periphery, where they will await being wirelessly called back, thus saving valuable land now devoted to parking. Not only parking space, but traffic congestion could be reduced because drivers will no longer have to look for parking spots. Car ownership rates could also be affected, as well as the taxi industry. And beyond that, driverless cars could change the nature of jobs in sectors ranging from public transit to auto body repair, car sales and service, policing, and emergency medicine.

Depending on the industry you serve, driverless cars could be a boon or the worst thing that has ever happened to your organization.

---

[13] (2011) *Extracting Value from Chaos*, IDC Digital Universe Study.
http://www.emc.com/about/news/press/2011/20110628-01.htm
[14] Ovsey, D. (2014) Driverless cars are only going to change just about everything, Financial Post, June 17.
http://business.financialpost.com/2014/06/17/driverless-cars-are-only-going-to-change-just-about-everything/?__lsa=fd8d-6b18.

Make sure your organization keeps up with the relevant technological developments. Ask: What is the state of our technology infrastructure? What is our record with respect to technology adoption? Are we falling behind any of our competitors in the use of hardware, software, social media and so forth. Which technological developments will cause the most risk to our organization if we don't anticipate and deal with them now?

The Importance of Identifying Internal Change Drivers

It is not only external factors which drive organizational change; managers must pay attention to important internal change drivers as well. Analyze the following internal change drivers regularly to identify important areas that need attention:

1. *Financial measures, such as revenues, costs, profits and ratios*. Financial measures are tools used to track progress and success in achieving the objectives of the organization. They help the organization respond to changing circumstances, detect potential problems and take action before it is too late. However, if these measures are not taken regularly, are not used to benchmark the organization against its peers or are not interpreted correctly, they will be of little value in driving a change agenda. For example, there can be situations where the revenues of a company are going up but not as quickly as those of competitors, indicating a potential future problem.

2. *Competitive information, such as market share, customer satisfaction, competitor moves and responses.* This type of information allows the organization to learn as much as possible about its industry and competitors in order to anticipate and respond to challenges, such as key competitors' new strategies, new product introductions, entry into new markets, increases in market share and so forth. "Competitive intelligence" generally refers to more focused qualitative information, while "business intelligence" is the focused gathering, storing and analyzing of customer data, as well as in-depth analysis of business statistics, which is usually a quantitative exercise. Both allow the organization to respond with appropriate change initiatives.

3. *Quality data, such as defects, returns and complaints.* If a benchmark analysis shows that the organization's quality measures are inferior to those of relevant peers or competitors, a wide range of tools and techniques can be used for identifying, measuring, prioritizing and improving processes that are critical to quality.

4. *Innovation measures, such as new product or service introductions, time-to-market, patents and technology adoptions.* These measures are especially important for organizations whose business models depend on product leadership or those in the high-tech industries. Companies that discourage or penalize risk taking will find that very few employees are willing to create or propose innovations. Even successful and venerable products need to be refreshed; otherwise the products will reach maturity and start to decline.

5. *Employee measures, such as satisfaction, productivity, complaints, turnover and absenteeism.* These measures help predict employee engagement, and high levels of engagement are associated with various measures of organizational success. For example, accordingly to Aon Hewitt's "2013 Trends in Global Employee Engagement" report, every 1 percent increase in employee engagement is associated with a 0.6 percent growth in sales.[15] Furthermore, a 2013 employee engagement benchmark study conducted by the Temkin Group concluded that engaged employees work harder: 96 percent of highly engaged employees say they try their hardest at work, compared with only 71 percent of those who are disengaged.[16]

---

[15] (2013) 2013 Trends in Global Engagement, Aon Hewitt. http://www.aon.com/attachments/human-capital-consulting/2013_Trends_in_Global_Employee_Engagement_Report.pdf.
[16] (2013) Employee Engagement Benchmark Study 2013, Temkin Group, January.

6. *Changes in the management team.* Each new manager, especially the CEO, brings his or her own ideas and ways of working in the organization and often creates major change. At the very least, relationships change, and the result is that an organization has to adapt accordingly.

7. *Unaligned organizational structures and/or policies.* Sometimes changes are necessary because of deficiencies in the present organizational structure or processes. There may be a mismatch between a new strategy and the divisional structure or too many levels of management, a lack of coordination between various departments, obstacles in communication, a lack of cooperation between the line and staff, and so on. These alignment problems are difficult to diagnose but one good tool that will help is the Queen's Industrial Relations Centre's "Blueprint for Organizational Effectiveness."[17] The blueprint asks: Do we have the right form for the work that needs to be done? For the required integration to get the work done? For the development of required capabilities? For the required level of creativity, flexibility and standardization? And for the required level of accountability and responsibility for decision-making?

8. *Lack of fit between the workforce and the work of the organization.* The nature of the workforce can change over time and become misaligned with new directions and priorities. For example, in an organization where there has been minimal turnover, older workers may not have the requisite skills and may need retraining or redeployment. Or it may be difficult to find employees with the right skill sets to replace retirees. Or there may be a "hole" in the managerial succession ranks because of previous layoffs. And so forth.

9. *Misaligned organizational strategy.* It is critically important to identify strategic misalignment early. Uncorrected problems compound quickly and can lead to decline of the organization. Symptoms of misaligned strategy include missed projections, stalled growth, weakening financial measures, and deteriorating communications among departments and/or divisions. The Queen's Industrial Relations Centre's "Blueprint for Organizational Effectiveness" provides a helpful diagnostic tool here as well. The blueprint asks: Do we have the right strategy given the business we are in? Given what's going on in our environment? Given our main strengths and capabilities? Given our customer needs and priorities?

Constructing a Case for Change by Answering the Important "Why" Questions

Although external and internal change drivers are the most frequent forces that cause organizations to embark upon change initiatives, they are not the only ones. Change leaders must understand all of these forces in order to explain them to the rest of the organization. This is part of building change readiness and getting people to accept that there is a need for change and that the status quo is no longer good enough.

Answering the following questions will help you construct a solid case for change:

• What are the internal and external drivers of change? What are the implications of these drivers?

• Does the proposed change respond to an imperative from above? Or to the strategic plan? If not, what was its genesis?

• What will likely happen if we do not introduce this change?

• How fast do we need to change?

---

[17] To obtain this blueprint, visit: http://irc.queensu.ca/articles/designing-organizations-blueprint-effectiveness.

- What data and information do we have that will prove the need for change to the rest of the organization?
- How do we stack up in comparison to other organizations with respect to key result areas (e.g., quality, client service, time to market, costs, revenues, profits, market share, innovation, employees)? A performance gap can create an urgent desire to catch up and surpass others within the organization.

Other relevant questions to answer might include:
- What is working well and why?
- What is not working and why?
- What needs are not being met?
- What resources are not being fully used?
- What opportunities are being ignored?
- What are our competitors doing?
- What are our key customers (or, in the case of public sector organizations, our client groups and political stakeholders) demanding?
- What more is possible: With technology? With new methods? With new relationships?
- What future scenarios do we predict for our organization?

Change leaders sometimes make the mistake of answering these questions in isolation, but we recommend that you seek wider input, either through size-up teams or through gathering input in various ways. There are a number of useful tools that you can use to gather this information, which include mind maps; PEST analyses (political, economic, socio-demographic, technological); environmental scans; gap analysis tools; organizational reviews; SWOT analyses (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats); key stakeholder analyses; benchmarking initiatives; client, citizen or employee surveys; external reports; and focus groups. Remember, the more input you gather, and the more participation in this process, the more convincing your case for change will be.

Communicate Why Change is Necessary

Once this information has been gathered and analyzed, it should be summarized into a concise statement that explains why the organization needs this particular change and why the change is urgent. And then you must share the information with the wider organization. Keeping it confined to the executive and managerial ranks is a mistake. Communications during change will be covered in a subsequent chapter, but meanwhile think of the variety of ways you can communicate why the change is necessary: hold meetings and videoconferences; create interventions or study groups; take surveys; and so forth. An interesting study on this topic by well-known academic Bert Spector is described in the next highlight.

<div style="border: 1px solid red;">

Organizational Leaders Do Not Change Organizations: An Academic Study

Bert Spector, a well-known academic, studied six companies engaged in organizational change over a four-year period.[18] What became clear from the study? Organizational leaders do not change organizations. Rather, they must diffuse the awareness of the need for change throughout the organization so that others will actually institute new ways of thinking and acting.

Spector found the companies used the following strategies for creating change readiness:
• Sharing competitive information, such as financial data or information from clients.
• Using models and examples of other organizations that are doing better.
• Using behavioral interventions, such as retreats, employee surveys and focus groups.
• Mandating. Spector found that this method could be effective as long as it was not directed personally. Ordering people to change simply didn't work, and threats may create compliance but not commitment.

Other lessons from the study: No single intervention was sufficient to create readiness, and change leaders should use many different ways to sell the need for change.

</div>

One of the quickest and most effective ways to communicate and create the need for change is by holding large scale interventions (see the appendix at the end of this chapter for brief descriptions of a few techniques). At the Queen's Industrial Relations Centre, we used one of these techniques to help an Ontario company create the energy for a needed change. Our design is described in the case study that follows.

Case Study: Creating the Need for Change at Peregrine[19]

In the mid-1990s, General Motors of Canada spun off many non-profitable and non-core businesses. One of them was Peregrine, a plastics plant, which was sold to a turnaround company that intended to improve operations and then resell it in the future. One day the plant was part of the large GM machine, the next day the workforce was part of a relatively small supplier. Same employees, same union, same management, same plant—but a different owner. In short notice, it became apparent that the plant was losing millions of dollars each month. Their survival was at stake. However, the employees were still wedded to their old personal entitlements—a tradition of life-long employment and job security in exchange for showing up for work each day. They also believed that "mother GM" would always take care of them. But GM had no intention of providing that level of support.

GM informed the new company that it would be awarded a five-year contract but that at the end of the five years GM may or may not continue to buy parts from them. Peregrine employees didn't believe this, so they continued to operate as usual and didn't pay much attention to the quality of their parts, which was not up to standard. It became clear they were in danger of failing the quality test after the five years.

That's when the senior leaders, at both the management and union levels, turned to us to design an intervention to quickly put an end to the complacency that was impeding change. We designed a series of large group meetings with the staff in waves. The first wave was with the senior people, and then the

---

[18] Spector, B.A. (1989) From bogged down to fired up: Inspiring organizational change, *MIT Sloan Management Review,* 30, no. 4, p. 29.

[19] I am indebted to Brenda Barker Scott, Don Heath, Rick Adkins and Alan Loyst who helped plan and implement this project.

meetings cascaded down to all employees in medium-sized groups. The meetings started with the union president and the human resources manager standing side by side and declaring that the company was in trouble and needed to rethink its quality. Next, the president outlined what he saw going on in the environment, which included the organization's challenges, opportunities, strengths and weaknesses.

Then an expert from the automotive industry association spoke about key industry developments. He reported that automobile assemblers such as GM were in the process of classifying automotive parts companies in Ontario into three tiers. Tier one included companies that were going to thrive because GM and other assemblers were going to keep on sourcing from them. Tier two companies were going to be the suppliers they would go to for overflow business. And tier three companies were those with substandard quality, high prices or both, and were going to be struck off the supplier list. Next, the financial officer showed several metrics that illustrated the cost of quality, how much money the company was losing every day because of poor quality, and so forth.

But what really made the difference was that the manager from the nearby GM plant, the plant they had been counting on for business into the far future, gave a sobering assessment of the situation. He held up a part and said, "See this part? I pay ten dollars for this part, and the quality stinks. Next year I'm going to pay five dollars, and I want the quality improved. And the year after that I want to pay three dollars, and I want the quality improved by another 100 percent. And if you don't do that, then I'm going to buy from someone else."

This was the first time they had ever heard it from the horse's mouth, their customer. It was the first time the majority believed there was a need for change. They realized they had to pick up their socks and improve their quality. And they did.

Summary

The first question organization members have to ask when a change is proposed is: Why do we need to change? This paper gave you advice on how to create a good case for change based on facts and data from both the internal and external business environments. Here are the steps I recommend:

1. Examine the external change drivers by thinking about the trends currently happening in the following areas:
   a. Business or competitive environment
   b. Political and regulatory issues
   c. Economic conditions
   d. Social and demographic shifts
   e. Technological developments

2. Look for possible internal change drivers, including:
   a. Financial measures
   b. Competitive information
   c. Quality data
   d. Innovation measures
   e. Employee measures
   f. Changes in the management team
   g. Unaligned organizational structures and/or policies
   h. Lack of fit between the workforce and the work of the organization
   i. Misaligned organizational strategy

3. Construct a solid case for change.
4. Seek wider input from organizational members.
5. Summarize the information into a concise statement that explains why the organization needs this particular change and why the change is urgent.
6. Communicate your case for change widely and in a variety of ways.

Appendix: A Summary of Large Group Intervention Techniques

Large group interventions gather representatives of a whole system or organization to discuss and take action on a specific change or other agenda. Often these techniques fuse planning and implementation, thereby shortening the time needed to conceive and execute projects. Although these techniques share some similarities, their designs are different. Some of the particularly well-known approaches are described below.[20]

Future Search

Developed by Marvin Weisbord, the Future Search approach organizes a group of sixty-four stakeholders into mixed settings over two-and-a-half days, aiming to integrate system-learning, self-management and committed action.[21] The approach is a highly standardized one, and it is implemented by an expert group, normally consisting of eight to ten key stakeholders, over several months. The sixty-four participants are chosen by the planning and steering committee to represent the unique perspectives of the organization and to develop common ground together.

Groups are structured by systemic criteria, all participants are regarded as experts and members of a community of responsibility, and everyone is encouraged to think of themselves as "being together in one boat." The session is chaired by a facilitator who guides the participants through a structured process, and participants sit at round tables in mixed stakeholder groups with about eight people to a table. The starting point is the diagnosis of time lines where participants discuss the past history, the present state and the desired future of the organization. Then participants create a giant mind map to show the current reality in all its messy complexity, and this is followed by a session where people say what they are proud of and sorry about regarding the current situation. Next, the participants envisage and present ideal future scenarios. From those presentations, the group identifies common ground, leaving unresolved differences acknowledged and listed but not worked on. This common ideal future should act as a pulling force that energizes stakeholders to achieve the shared future vision. Follow-up activities are typically not organized.

The basic principles of the Future Search approach are aimed at getting the whole system in the room, exploring all aspects of a system before trying to fix any single part, highlighting common ground, treating problems and conflicts as information, not action items, and having people accept responsibility for their own work, conclusions and action plans.[22]

Open Space

The Open Space methodology,[23] developed by Harrison Owen, allows participants to create and manage their own parallel meetings around a central theme. Using the informality of an unstructured coffee break as a foundation design, participants, often in large numbers and usually representing enormous diversity, create their own agendas, pool their ideas and develop plans for collaborative action. Owen sees Open Space as a new way to hold better meetings. It is oriented towards playfulness, passion and responsibility.

---

[20] For more complete descriptions, refer to: Bunker, B., and Alban, B. (1997) *Large Group Interventions: Engaging the Whole System for Rapid Change*, 1st ed. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass).

[21] Weisbord, M. (1992) *Discovering Common Ground: How Future Search Conferences Bring People Together to Achieve Breakthrough Innovation, Empowerment, Shared Vision and Collaborative Action*, 1st ed. (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler).

[22] Weisbord, M., and Janof, S. (1995) *Future Search. An Action Guide to Finding Common Ground in Organizations and Communities*, 1st ed. (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler).

[23] Owen, H. (1997) Expanding Our Now: The Story of Open Space Technology, 1st ed. (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler).

The Open Space approach is effective in resolving complex or conflict-ridden issues in a short period of time and when innovation and ownership are the desired outcomes. A precondition is that the focal issue must be of genuine concern to all involved. The group can be of any size, and the meeting can be of any length, although it's usually one to three days. All stakeholders are invited, but participation is voluntary.

Appreciative Inquiry

Appreciative Inquiry is not only a method but also a philosophy.[24] It is different from other change analyses in that it starts from positive assumptions about people, organizations and social relationships. By beginning with unconditional positive questions, it gives rise to positive conversations and actions. Typical questions are:

1. Think of a time at your organization when you felt most engaged, most excited and most alive. What were the factors and forces that made it a great experience? What was it about you, others and your organization that made it a peak experience for you?

2. What do you value most about yourself, your work and your organization?

3. What is the core factor that gives life to your organization?

4. What are the three most important hopes you have for heightening the health and vitality of your organization in the future?

The stories generated by these questions are used to create motivating images of the organization and its future. Appreciative Inquiry is based on the idea that when people focus on problems, these problems and the conflicts they generate seem to grow. However, by focusing on ideals, achievements, peak experiences and best practices, these positive phenomena tend to grow and thrive. It focuses on imagination and innovation instead of negatives and criticism.

Whole-Scale Change

The Whole-Scale Change approach,[25] which was developed by Kathie Dannemiller and others, has been used for a variety of applications, including strategic planning, work design, reengineering, training and culture change. This approach can be used with large or small groups to address a wide variety of issues.

An adaptation of Beckhard and Harris's formula[26] for change, D×V×F>R, guides the approach. The assumption behind the formula is that if an organization wants to accomplish system-wide change, it must work with a critical mass of the organization to uncover and create member dissatisfaction (D) with the present state, uncover and create a compelling vision (V) of the future, and take first steps (F) towards reaching the vision. In simpler terms, people must understand why change is necessary, they must buy into a common vision of the future, and they must understand what action is necessary to start the change in the right direction. The values of D, V and F all need to be greater than zero in order to exceed people's resistance (R) to change.

---

[24] Cooperrider, D.L. (1999) Positive image, positive action: The affirmative basis of organizing, in *Appreciative Management and Leadership: The Power of Positive Thought and Action in Organizations*, ed. S. Srivastva and D. L. Cooperrider, revised edition (Euclid, Ohio: Williams Custom), pp. 91-125.

[25] Dannemiller Tyson Associates (2000) *Whole-Scale Change,* (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler).

[26] Beckhard, R., and Harris, R.T. (1977) *Organizational Transitions: Managing Complex Change,* 1st ed. (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley).

Whole-Scale Change relies on a large-scale meeting of stakeholders to create energy for the change. The authors state that there must be a clear purpose for the meeting, a core leadership committed to accomplishing this purpose, an event planning team whose members are a microcosm of the planned meeting, and a logistics team to ensure the meeting runs smoothly. There must also be large numbers of organization members who are willing to work with others they may not know. The steps taken during the meeting include building a common database of information, determining what the data mean for the organization, agreeing on change goals, committing to specific actions, and taking time to check and measure what was agreed upon. The steps are accomplished through a series of small and/or large group interactions. The assumption of this method is that while conflict may be difficult at first, the outcomes will end up being very positive. Another assumption is that stakeholders must understand the change challenge from a whole-systems perspective.

World Café Method

The World Café methodology[27] is a simple and flexible format for hosting a large group dialogue. It can be modified to meet a wide variety of needs, but the basic model includes the following five components:

1. *Setting:* Create a special environment, most often modelled after a café, with items such as small round tables covered with a checkered tablecloth, butcher block paper, coloured pens, a vase of flowers and an optional "talking stick" item. There should be four chairs at each table.

2. *Welcome and Introduction:* The host begins with a warm welcome and an introduction to the World Café process, setting the context, sharing the café etiquette and putting participants at ease.

3. *Small Group Rounds:* The process begins with the first of three or more twenty-minute rounds of conversation for the small group seated around a table. At the end of the twenty minutes, each member of the group moves to a different table. For the next round, they may or may not choose to leave one person as the "table host," who welcomes the next group and briefly fills them in on what happened in the previous round.

4. *Questions:* Each round is prefaced with a question designed for the specific context and desired purpose of the session. The same questions can be used for more than one round, or they can be built upon to focus the conversation or guide its direction.

5. *Harvest:* After the small groups (and/or in between rounds, as desired), individuals are invited to share insights or other results from their conversations with the rest of the large group. These results are reflected visually in a variety of ways, most often using graphic recorders at the front of the room.

---

[27] The World Café Community Foundation, World Café Method, http://www.theworldcafe.com/method.html.

References

2006 C.I.P.A. Winners. (2006). Canadian Information Productivity Awards. Retrieved February 20, 2015, from http://www.cipa.ca/award_winners/winners_06/Bizpal.html

2013 Trends in Global Engagement. (2013). Aon Hewitt. Retrieved February 20, 2015, from http://www.aon.com/attachments/human-capital-consulting/2013_Trends_in_Global_Employee_Engagement_Report.pdf.

Andrews, G. C. (2009). *Canadian professional engineering and geoscience: Practice and ethics* (4th ed., p. 3). Toronto, ON: Nelson Education.

Barker Scott, B. (2011). Designing Organizations: A Blueprint for Effectiveness. Queen's University IRC. Retrieved February 20, 2015, from http://irc.queensu.ca/articles/designing-organizations-blueprint-effectiveness

Barman, T. (2014, May). Rethinking the value chain—Ethical cultural change at Siemens: A case study, Chartered Global Management Accountant. Retrieved February 20, 2015, from http://www.cgma.org/Resources/DownloadableDocuments/ethical-culture-change-at-siemens.pdf.

Beatty, C. A. (2007). Downsizing Success at the Ministry of Labour. Queen's University Industrial Relations Centre. Unpublished.

Beatty, C. A. (2009). Downsizing Your Organization? Lessons from the Trenches. Queen's University IRC. Retrieved February 20, 2015, from http://irc.queensu.ca/articles/downsizing-your-organization-lessons-trenches

Beatty, C. A. Syncrude - Partners in Development. Unpublished.

Beckhard, R., & Harris, R.T. (1977). *Organizational Transitions: Managing Complex Change*, 1st ed. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Brownell, C. (2014, June 11). One in five executives thinks corruption is widespread in Canada's business world, EY report shows. *Financial Post*. Retrieved February 20, 2015, from http://business.financialpost.com/2014/06/11/ey-canada-curruption/?__lsa=0673-673a .

Bunker, B., & Alban, B. (1997). *Large Group Interventions: Engaging the Whole System for Rapid Change*. (1st ed.) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Conerly, B. (2014, January 12). Long-term Economic Forecast: Key Issues and Business Strategy Implications. Retrieved February 20, 2015, from http://www.forbes.com/sites/billconerly/2014/01/12/long-term-economic-forecast-key-issues-and-business-strategy-implications/

Cooperrider, D.L. (1999). Positive image, positive action: The affirmative basis of organizing. In S. Srivastva & D. Cooperrider (Eds.), *Appreciative management and leadership: The power of positive thought and action in organizations* (Revised edition ed., pp. 91-125). Euclid, OH: Williams Custom.

Dannemiller Tyson Associates. (2000). *Whole-Scale Change.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Dean, T. (2011, September). Why competition between civil servants, corporations and non-profits is good for everyone. *Literary Review of Canada*. Retrieved February 20, 2015, from Retrieved February 20, 2015, from http://reviewcanada.ca/magazine/2011/09/is-public-service-delivery-obsolete/.

EMC Press Release. (2011). *Extracting Value from Chaos*, IDC Digital Universe Study. Retrieved February 20, 2015, from http://www.emc.com/about/news/press/2011/20110628-01.htm Employee Engagement Benchmark Study 2013. (2013, January). Temkin Group.

Ghemawat, P., & Nueno, J.L. (2003). Zara: Fast fashion, Technical report. Harvard Business School Multimedia Case 9, pp. 703-487.

LaPalombara, J., & Blank, S. (1976). *Multinational Corporations and National Elites: A Study in Tensions.* New York, NY: The Conference Board.

Masters, J. (2005, January 26). Social values and public policy: From opportunities to rights and back to opportunities. Center for Community Futures. Retrieved February 20, 2015, from http://www.cencomfut.com/social_values.htm.

Ovsey, D. (2014, June 17). Driverless cars are only going to change just about everything. *Financial Post*. Retrieved February 20, 2015, from http://business.financialpost.com/2014/06/17/driverless-cars-are-only-going-to-change-just-about-everything/?__lsa=fd8d-6b18.

Owen, H. (1997). Expanding Our Now: The Story of Open Space Technology. (1st ed.) San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Song, X. (2009). Why do change management strategies fail? *Journal of Cambridge Studies*, 4, no. 1, p. 7.

Spector, B.A. (1989). From bogged down to fired up: Inspiring organizational change, MIT *Sloan Management Review,* 30, no. 4, p. 29.

World Café Method. (n.d.). The World Café Community Foundation. Retrieved February 20, 2015, from http://www.theworldcafe.com/method.html.

Weisbord, M. (1992). *Discovering Common Ground: How Future Search Conferences Bring People Together to Achieve Breakthrough Innovation, Empowerment, Shared Vision and Collaborative Action* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Weisbord, M., & Janof, S. (1995). *Future Search. An Action Guide to Finding Common Ground in Organizations and Communities* (1st ed.) San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

.

About the Author

Carol Beatty is former Director of the Industrial Relations Centre at Queen's University at Kingston, Ontario, and an Associate Professor with Queen's School of Business, where she has taught in undergraduate, graduate and executive education programs.

An acknowledged expert on change management, strategy development, high performance teams and facilitation, Dr. Beatty focuses her consulting on human and organizational issues in modern organizations. She has studied the implementation of change for over 25 years, including technological change, strategic change, mergers and acquisitions, structural change, and employee buyouts.

An active researcher, she is currently completing a multi-faceted study on the key success factors of change management, comprised of a large-scale survey and several detailed case studies. She is also well-known for her major study of high-performance teams in which she isolated the three skill sets teams need to develop to be effective. Dr. Beatty's publications have appeared in such journals as the *Sloan Management Review, Human Relations,* the *California Management Review* and the *Business Quarterly*. She completed her MBA and PhD at the Ivey School of Business at the University of Western Ontario.

Carol is a sought-after consultant and speaker who has helped many private and public sector organizations become more effective. She is a trained facilitator in Future Search (Weisbord and Janoff) and Whole System Change (Dannemiller Tyson).

Recent publications include *Building Smart Teams: A Roadmap to High Performance Teams* (2004 with B. Barker), and *Employee Ownership: The New Source of Competitive Advantage* (2001 with H. Schachter). In addition, Dr. Beatty has authored several complex multimedia business simulations used in high-level human resources education: Panorama at the Crossroads, Change-O-Meter, and Harmon Health.

Carol can be contacted at: carol.beatty@queensu.ca

Queen's University
IRC
Talent engaged

Industrial Relations Centre (IRC)
Queen's University
Kingston, ON K7L 3N6
irc.queensu.ca

Queen's
UNIVERSITY | Arts and Science